



CITY OF LONG BEACH

333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor

Long Beach, CA 90802

FAX (562) 570-6753

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

\$25.00 FILING FEE

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: Office of the County Clerk
Environmental Filings
12400 E. Imperial Highway, #1101
Norwalk, CA 90650

From: Community & Environmental Planning Division
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Date Mailed:

In conformance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, please post this notice for period of 20 days. Enclosed is the required fee of \$25.00 for processing.

Notice is hereby given that the Long Beach purposes of CEQA, proposes to adopt a subsequent Negative Declaration for the project listed below:

1. **Project Location:**

2. **Project Title:**

3. **Project Description:**

4. Review period during which the Lead Agency will receive comments on the proposed mitigated Negative Declaration:

Starting Date:

Ending Date:

5. Public Meeting of the

Date:

Time:

Location: City Council Chambers
Long Beach City Hall
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Plaza Level

6. Copies of the report and all referenced documents are available for review by contacting the undersigned or on the web at: www.longbeach.gov/plan/pb/epd/er.asp
7. The site is not on any list as enumerated under Section 65965.5 of the California Government Code.
8. The Initial Study may find significant adverse impacts to occur to the following resource areas:
9. The Negative Declaration has no significant impacts to occur.

For additional information contact:

333 West Ocean Boulevard, Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

CITY OF LONG BEACH

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT:

I. TITLE:

II. PROPONENT

III. DESCRIPTION

IV. LOCATION

V. HEARING DATE & TIME

VI. HEARING LOCATION

FINDING*:

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the Long Beach City Planning Commission has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, the Commission hereby finds that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report because the Mitigation Measures described in the initial study have been added to the project.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

- * If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references.

This document and supporting attachments are provided for review by the general public. This is an information document about environmental effects only. Supplemental information is on file and may be reviewed in the office listed above. The decision making body will review this document and potentially many other sources of information before considering the proposed project.

INITIAL STUDY



Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Community and Environmental Planning
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Fifth Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

INITIAL STUDY

- 1. Project title:**
- 2. Lead agency name and address:**
- 3. Contact person and phone number:**
- 4. Project location:**
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:**
- 6. General Plan:**
- 7. Zoning:**

8. Description of project:

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology/Soils
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology/Water Quality	Land Use/Planning
Mineral Resources	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System	Noise
Population/Housing	Public Services	Recreation
Transportation	Utilities/Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the Environment and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. A “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with “Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration Section 1 5063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated”, describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

[Insert Vicinity Map]

[Insert Project Map]

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section §15064.5?
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
 - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?
 - iv) Landslides?
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –

Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise degrade water quality?				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?
- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

XI. NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM – Would the project:

- a) Result in a significant loss of pervious surface?
- b) Create a significant discharge of pollutants into the storm drain or water way?
- c) Violate any best management practices of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit?

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- a) Fire protection?
- b) Police protection?
- c) Schools?
- d) Parks?
- e) Other public facilities?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION –				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				
g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS –				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact:

There are no declared scenic vistas or routes within the project site vicinity. While Cherry Avenue serves as a major north-south corridor for the Long Beach area, this major arterial is not considered a visual corridor. The project site land use is a storage facility consisting of nine one-story self-storage buildings (Buildings A through H and Building J) and one three-story warehouse building (Building I). The one-story storage buildings are utilitarian in design and typical of this type of land use. The three-story building has a light industrial warehouse appearance from the Cherry Avenue street frontage and displays the Public Storage company signage design. While none of the project site buildings show any signs of deferred maintenance or structural deterioration, these structures are visually undistinguished in terms of aesthetic design.

The project would have minimal impacts on the overall visual character of the subject site and no impact on the portion of the site visible from Cherry Avenue. Project construction primarily involves interior renovation of the pick-up and delivery portion of the three-story warehouse building to remodel the first floor and add new second and third stories for a total of 636 self-storage units on all three floors (see Attachment No. 1, Project Plans). The only exterior modifications would be minor changes to this three-story building on the north and east elevations, involving removal and relocation of sliding doors. Neither building elevation is visible from Cherry Avenue or any other public right-of-way.

B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact:

The proposed project is located in a highly urbanized area that does not contain any scenic resources. Moreover, the project site is not located on or near a designated State Scenic Highway.

C. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

No Impact:

Please see Section I (A) above for discussion.

D. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No Impact:

The project involves interior renovation with minor changes to exterior glass sliding doors, which would not create any new sources of light or glare and would not be visible from outside the project site.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

The project site is not located within an agricultural zone, and there are no agricultural zones within the vicinity of the project. The proposed project is located within a section of the City that has been developed for over 60 years. There are no agricultural resources in or around the project site, and therefore the project will have no effect on agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or county. The proposal will have no effect upon agriculture resources.

III. AIR QUALITY

The South Coast Air Basin is subject to possibly some of the worst air pollution in the country, attributable mainly to its topography, climate, meteorological conditions, a large population base, and highly dispersed urban land use patterns.

Air quality conditions are primarily affected by the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by climatic conditions that influence the movement and dispersion of pollutants. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local and regional topography, provide the links between air pollutant emissions and air quality.

The South Coast Air Basin generally has a limited capability to disperse air contaminants because of its low wind speeds and persistent

temperature inversions. In the Long Beach area, predominantly daily winds consist of morning onshore airflow from the southwest at a mean speed of 7.3 miles per hour and afternoon and evening offshore airflow from the northwest at 0.2 to 4.7 miles per hour with little variability between seasons. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. The prevailing winds carry air contaminants northward and then eastward over Whittier, Covina, Pomona and Riverside.

The majority of pollutants normally found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are dominated by sources other than automobile exhaust.

A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan?

No Impact:

The Southern California Association of Governments has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the sub region in which it is located, it is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategy specified in the AQMP. The project is consistent with the goals of the City of Long Beach Air Quality Element that calls for achieving air quality improvements in a manner that continues economic growth.

B. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

No Impact:

The California Air Resources Board regulates mobile emissions and oversees the activities of county Air Pollution Control Districts (APCDs) and regional Air Quality Management Districts (AQMDs) in California. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the regional agency empowered to regulate stationary and mobile sources in the South Coast Air Basin.

To determine whether a project generates sufficient quantities of air pollution to be considered significant, the SCAQMD adopted maximum thresholds of significance for mobile and stationary producers in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), (i.e., cars, trucks, buses and energy

consumption). SCAQMD Conformity Procedures (Section 6.3 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993) states that all government actions that generate emission greater than the following thresholds are considered regionally significant (see Table 1).

Table 1 SCAQMD Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds (lbs/day)	Operational Thresholds (lbs/day)
ROC	75	55
NO _x	100	55
CO	550	550
PM ₁₀	150	150
SO _x	150	150

Project generated emissions would be limited to demolition equipment activities and truck trips related to both movement of demolition equipment and removal of demolition debris. It is anticipated that demolition will be completed in approximately 8 working days. The estimated emissions produced during the duration of the demolition activities are provided below in Table 2. The source of these estimates is from SCAQMD's URBEMIS 2002 Version 7.5.0 air pollution emissions model.

Table 2 Estimated Project Emissions

	ROC	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀
Project Emissions	3.15	23.44	27.64	2.31
AQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No

- C. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

No Impact:

Please see Sections III (A) and (B) above for discussion.

- D. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation:

During construction activities, truck trips to and from the project site could generate potentially significant amounts of dust and particulate matter along Cherry Avenue and Carson Street. Since this is an interior renovation project, no significant levels of dust or particulate matter are anticipated on the project site and adjoining properties. However, adherence to the following mitigation measure will reduce the potential impacts from construction truck trips to a level of insignificance:

1. All construction activities shall conform to Rule 403 of the South Coast Air Quality Water District on Fugitive Dust.

It is anticipated that any potential impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporation.

E. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No Impact:

The proposed construction activities would not generate or emit any objectionable odors. Construction odors would be limited to periodic diesel emissions from trucks hauling construction materials and equipment, which are generally not understood as objectionable and regulated by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The project site is located within a highly urbanized portion of the City, with predominately commercial land uses along the east side of Cherry Avenue and residential uses both west of Cherry Avenue and east of the project site in the City of Lakewood. The project site is improved with self-storage buildings and paved parking and drive aisle areas. On-site vegetation is limited to the landscaped area along the Cherry Avenue street frontage and portions of the three-story building, consisting of common horticultural shrub and ground cover species. There is no evidence of rare or sensitive species as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations or Title 50 of the Federal Code of Regulations.

The project site is not located in a protected wetlands area. The proposed interior renovations would not interfere with the migratory movement of

any wildlife species. The biological habitat and species diversity is limited to that typically found in highly populated and urbanized Southern California settings.

No adverse impacts are anticipated to biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

There is some evidence to indicate that primitive people inhabited portions of the City as early as 5,000 to 2,000 B.C. Much of the remains and artifacts of these ancient people have been destroyed as the City has been developed. Of the archaeological sites remaining, many of them are located in the southeast sector of the City.

The proposed interior renovation of the existing three-story storage building will not require any excavation to remove building foundations. Therefore, project construction will not impact any unknown latent artifacts. The project site is located outside the area of the City expected to have a higher probability of latent artifacts.

No adverse impacts are anticipated to cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

No faults are known to pass beneath the project site, and the site is not in the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The most significant fault system in the vicinity is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. Other potentially active faults in the area are the Richfield Fault, the Marine Stadium Fault, the Palos Verdes Fault and the Los Alamitos Fault.

Based on the Seismic Safety Element of the City's General Plan, the project site is located in an area with low liquefaction potential. The Long Beach Seismic Safety Element also identifies the project site as outside the tsunami influence area. The relative close proximity of the Newport-Inglewood Fault could create substantial ground shaking at the proposed site if a seismic event occurred along the fault. However, there are numerous variables that determine the level of damage to a given location. Given these variables it is not possible to determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event.

A. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

No Impact:

The proposed project is not located within a delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?**

No Impact:

See discussion above.

- iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

No Impact:

See discussion above.

- iv) Landslides?**

No Impact:

The project site is situated on flat, level ground and is not susceptible to landslides from nearby bluffs or hillsides.

- B. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

No Impact:

The project activities are limited to interior renovation of an existing three-story storage facility. No building demolition is necessary for this project, and therefore the project will not result in any soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

- C. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

No Impact:

The project site is not located within a delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and is in an area with a low liquefaction potential.

D. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No Impact:

The project is not located in an area of expansive soils as defined in Table 18-1 B of the Uniform Building Code.

E. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact:

The project will not include any structures or facilities that will connect to the municipal sanitary sewer system.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

No Impact:

There is no record of evidence of any hazards or hazardous materials in or around the project site. Project activities are limited to interior renovation of an existing three-story storage facility, with no demolition of any structures which could contain asbestos and/or lead paint. There will be no transport, use or disposal of any hazardous materials as a result of project construction or operation.

B. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

No Impact:

Please see Section VII (A) above for discussion.

- C. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

No Impact:

Please see Section VII (A) above for discussion.

- D. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

No Impact:

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. The Cortese List does not list the proposed project site as contaminated with hazardous materials.

- E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact:

The proposed project site is not located within the airport land use plan.

- F. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact:

Please see Section VII (E) above for discussion.

- G. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

No Impact:

The renovation of this storage facility will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

H. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

No Impact:

The project site is within an urbanized setting and will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Flood Insurance Administration has prepared a new Flood Hazard Map designating potential flood zones, based on the projected inundation limits for breach of the Hansen Dam and that of the Whittier Narrows Dam, as well as the 100-year flood as delineated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which was adopted in July 1998.

The project site is not located within a FEMA designated flood zone (X zone designation). All storm and sanitary sewer drains are currently in place for the project site vicinity.

A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

No Impact:

The storage facility renovations will not violate wastewater discharge standards. The proposed project would comply with all state and federal requirements pertaining to preservation of water quality. The site is in an urbanized area and is not adjacent to any major water source.

B. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing

nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

No Impact:

The project is limited to building renovations with no new foundations or grading activities, and therefore will not involve any grading that would affect the groundwater table in the area. Project operations would not be expected to adversely affect groundwater supplies.

- C. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

No Impact:

The project site is within a highly urbanized area with stormwater drainage infrastructure in place. There would be no change in the amount of impervious surfaces in the project site since the project involves interior renovation of an existing storage building. Runoff from the site is therefore not expected to exceed the capacity of the local storm drain system.

- D. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

No Impact:

Please see Sections VIII (B) and (C) above for discussion.

- E. Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

No Impact:

Please see Sections VIII (B) and (C) above for discussion.

- F. Would the project otherwise degrade water quality?**

No Impact:

Please see Sections VIII (B) and (C) above for discussion.

G. Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact:

No housing is proposed as part of this project. The scope of this project is limited to remodeling the first floor and construction of second and third story floors to create storage units inside an existing storage building and minor exterior modifications of doors on the north and east elevations.

H. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact:

No new structures are proposed as part of this project.

I. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

No Impact:

The proposed project is not within a zone influenced by flooding due to failure of a levee or dam.

J. Would the project result in inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?

No Impact:

The project site is not within a zone influenced by the inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow as shown in the Long Beach Seismic Element.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

A. Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact:

The project site is an existing Public Storage facility located on the east side of Cherry Avenue (4100 Cherry Avenue), north of Carson Street at the Cartagena Street T-intersection.

The project site is presently improved with nine one-story story buildings (Buildings A through H and Building J) and a three-story building (Building I) containing a self-storage warehouse, pick-up and delivery warehouse, and office space. The pick-up and delivery warehouse area for this three-story building is presently open from the ground floor and used for stacked container storage.

The proposed renovations to this building would not physically divide the established community or any existing land use patterns. No new structures or changes in land use, other than interior renovations to change from stacked container storage to three floors for self-storage units, would result from this project.

B. Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact:

The project site currently has two zoning designations: the southern two-thirds of the project site fronting Cherry Avenue is in the CHW Regional Highway Commercial District. This CHW portion of this site extends 403 feet east into this property. The remainder of the site is in the CS Commercial Storage district.

As part of this project, the applicant is requesting approval of a Zone Change to rezone the CHW portion of this site to the CS district. Self-storage land uses are not permitted in the CHW district, but are permitted in the CS district only with approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The applicant has also requested Conditional Use Permit approval to allow expansion of this existing self-storage land use. Approval of the Zone Change and Conditional Use Permit requests would allow the project to proceed in compliance with applicable local land use regulations.

C. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?

No Impact:

There is no applicable conservation plan adopted or proposed for the project site.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

The primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach has been oil. From the beginning of this century, oil extraction operations within the City have diminished as this resource has become depleted due to extraction operations. Today oil extraction continues but on a much reduced scale in comparison to that which occurred in the past. The project site does not contain any oil extraction operations and the project is not anticipated to have a negative impact on this resource. There are no other known mineral resources on the site that could be negatively impacted by project demolition and construction activities.

No adverse impacts are anticipated to mineral resources.

XI. NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES)

The nature of this project will not trigger conformance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulation of the Clean Water Act of 1972 as amended. This Act requires applicable projects to obtain an NPDES permit and comply with development standards. The intent of this Act is to reduce, to the maximum extent practical, water borne pollutants from entering storm water drainage systems and ultimately, receiving water bodies, i.e., oceans, lakes, and streams. The Los Angeles County Regional Water Quality Control Board is the lead agency for promulgating these regulations. The City of Long Beach received a separate NPDES permit in June 1999, with certain specified requirements from the Regional Water Quality Control Board to administer the NPDES regulations within its jurisdiction. The City of Long Beach Department of Planning and Building is charged with processing and enforcing NPDES regulations.

This project does not have the potential to violate the City's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System since the project is simply a renovation of an existing storage building and no new impervious surfaces are proposed as part of this project. However, all construction activities must adhere to the following mitigation measures:

1. All wastewater on the project site resulting from construction cleanup activities shall be pumped and removed to an appropriate disposal facility in accordance with NPDES requirements.
2. All streets and alleys in and on the perimeter of the project site shall be dry swept to minimize mud, along with all applicable NPDES requirements for pollutant reduction techniques when flushing paved surfaces.

It is anticipated that any potential impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporation.

XII. NOISE

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Measuring noise levels involves intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses, due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks and outdoor recreation areas are generally more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses.

The City of Long Beach uses the State Noise/Land Use Compatibility Standards, which suggests a desirable exterior noise exposure at 65 dBA CNEL for sensitive land uses such as residences. Less sensitive commercial and industrial uses may be compatible with ambient noise levels up to 70 dBA. The City of Long Beach has an adopted Noise Ordinance that sets exterior and interior noise standards. The project site is located in District 3 of the Noise District Map, which sets maximum exterior noise limits to 65 dBA every day on a 24 hour basis..

A. Would the project expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation:

Project construction has the potential to create noise levels in excess of those established by the Long Beach City Ordinance. During construction activities, the project may cause temporary increases in ambient noise levels. However, adherence to the following mitigation

measure will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level:

1. All project construction activities must conform to the City's Noise Ordinance. As stated in §8.80.202, "no person shall operate or permit the operation of any tools or equipment used for construction, alternation, repair, remodeling, drilling, demolition or any other related building activity which would produce loud or unusual noise which annoys or disturbs a reasonable person of normal sensitivity between the hours of seven p.m. and seven a.m."

It is anticipated that any potential impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporation.

B. Would the project expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact:

During demolition activities, nearby properties may experience some minor ground borne vibration. However, this effect will occur for a short duration of time and would not be a significant disruption to nearby land uses.

C. Would the project create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project will result in a total of 636 new storage units with total rentable floor area of 63,850 square feet for all three floors. At present, this open warehouse area can accommodate up to 1,503 pick-up and delivery containers (measuring 5 foot by 8 foot by 5 foot) with a storage capacity of 67,635 square feet. Any permanent increases in the ambient noise levels would be caused from project generated vehicle trips, since the on-site land use activities would not change substantially (loading and unloading of personal property for storage) and therefore would not generate any significant increases in project site noise levels.

A Traffic Impact Study has been prepared for this project and is included in this environmental review document as Attachment No. 2. This Study summarizes traffic generation forecasts for this project in Table A (page 6), indicating that net project site trips (defined as one-way vehicular movements either entering or exiting the project site at

the project driveway) resulting from conversion of the pick-up and delivery service area to 636 storage units would increase as follows: 166 daily weekday trips, 8 AM peak hour weekday trips, 15 PM peak hour weekday trips, 23 peak hour Saturday trips, and 16 peak hour Sunday trips. However, it is anticipated that most of these trips would be from passenger cars, pick-up trucks and small rental trucks (i.e., U-Haul trucks) rather than the larger commercial trucks needed to transport the pick-up and delivery containers (containers measure 5 foot by 8 foot by 5 foot) presently utilizing this storage area. The on-site noise impact from these smaller vehicles is therefore not anticipated to produce significant increased noise levels.

In terms of traffic noise levels, the Traffic Impact Study determined that the Level of Service at the Cherry Avenue and Carson Street intersection for both AM and PM peak traffic periods would not change as a result of this project, and therefore the project would not create congested intersection conditions that would result in increased noise levels.

Under present conditions, residential street traffic is occasionally impacted by large pick-up and delivery trucks utilizing Tehachapi Drive for local circulation routes. This is due to the fact that Cherry Avenue is not wide enough for large northbound trucks to make a U-turn at Tehachapi Drive and then move southbound on Cherry Avenue. As a result, trucks enter this adjacent residential neighborhood via Tehachapi Drive to make southbound turns on nearby local streets such as Orange Avenue. Conversion of this pick-up and delivery storage area to individual storage units would substantially reduce the need for larger delivery trucks and the resultant truck movements through this neighborhood (see Traffic Impact Study, page 12). The project would therefore result in less residential noise impacts through this reduction of large delivery trucks on local streets.

D. Would the project create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation:

Please see Section XII (A) above for discussion.

Project construction will involve some construction vehicle trips during typical workday hours, but the type and quantity of these vehicles is not anticipated to generate significant noise levels due to the nature of the building renovation activities. Heavy construction equipment such

as bulldozers and pile drivers will not be used in project construction since no grading or new structures are proposed as part of this project.

While any construction noise has the potential to create a temporary increase in the ambient noise level, the mitigation measure set forth in Section XII (A) above will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

No Impact:

The proposed development is not located within the airport land use plan.

- F. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area excessive noise levels?**

No Impact:

Please see Section XII (E) above for discussion.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The City of Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County and the fifth largest in California. According to the 2000 Census, Long Beach has a population of 461,522, which represents a 7.5 percent increase from the 1990 Census.

According to the 2000 Census, there were 163,088 housing units in Long Beach, with a Citywide vacancy rate of 6.32 percent. It is projected that a total population of approximately 499,705 persons will inhabit the City of Long Beach by the year 2010.

- A. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

No Impact:

The project will not create any new housing units or generate significant levels of employment growth that could induce population growth. Self-storage land uses are not significant employment generators since storage loading and unloading activities are not performed by facility staff and the office staffing needs are minimal. The project will not result in any new structures or infrastructure improvements. Therefore, this project would not induce population growth through conversion of a pick-up and delivery storage warehouse area to self-storage units.

B. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact:

The project site does not contain any existing housing units and the project would not eliminate any existing housing units either on-site or off-site. The project site is in the CHW and CS zoning districts, and neither zoning district permits any type of single or multi-family residential land uses.

C. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact:

Please see Section XIII (B) above for discussion.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire protection is provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 in-city stations. The Department is divided into Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The Fire Department is accountable for medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue calls from the community.

Crime prevention services are provided by the Long Beach Police Department. The Department is divided into Patrol, Traffic, Detective, Juvenile, Vice, Community, Jail, Records, and Administration Sections. The City has four Patrol Divisions; East, West, North and South.

The City of Long Beach is primarily served by the Long Beach Unified School District, which also serves Signal Hill and parts of Lakewood. The District has been operating at or over capacity in recent years.

The proposed project is an interior renovation to create storage units without a significant intensification of this existing storage land use in terms of overall storage area or creation of any new land uses, and therefore would not create any demands on any public services.

XV. RECREATION

The proposed project would not result in any land uses that would generate any demands on recreational resources, and therefore would not place any increased burden on the recreational facilities of the City.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Since 1980, Long Beach has experienced significant population growth. Continued growth is expected throughout this decade. Inevitably, growth will generate additional demand for travel. Without proper planning and necessary transportation improvements, this increase in travel demand, if unmanaged, could result in gridlock on freeways and streets, and jeopardize the tranquility of residential neighborhoods.

- A. Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Implementation:

Project construction is estimated to take place over no more than 180 calendar days. Heavy construction equipment such as bulldozers and pile drivers will not be used in project construction since no grading activities or new structures are proposed as part of this project.

A Traffic Impact Study has been prepared for this project and is included in this environmental review document as Attachment No. 2. This Study summarizes traffic generation forecasts for this project in Table A (page 6), indicating that net project site trips (defined as one-way vehicular movements either entering or exiting the project site at the project driveway) resulting from conversion of the pick-up and

delivery service warehouse area to 636 storage units would increase as follows: 166 daily weekday trips, 8 AM peak hour weekday trips, 15 PM peak hour weekday trips, 23 peak hour Saturday trips, and 16 peak hour Sunday trips. Table B of this Study (page 11) determines that both volume to capacity ratios and level of service at the Cherry Avenue and Carson Street intersection would remain unchanged by project generated trips under worst condition assumptions for both AM and PM peak hours (also refer to Exhibit "B" of this Study). As discussed on page 12, even a worst case assumption on the number of project generated trips on Tehachapi Drive would be below the significant threshold level. Furthermore, since the project would eliminate the existing pick-up and delivery service warehouse area for this facility and the associated need for large trucks trips, the project will substantially reduce the need for large trucks to use Tehachapi Drive as a diversion route. This Traffic Study concludes that the project will not result in any significant impacts upon either the Cherry Avenue and Carson Street intersection or the residential street segment of Tehachapi Drive (page 12).

While construction vehicles would not utilize local residential streets and the overall number of construction truck trips is not anticipated to significantly impact the surrounding street infrastructure, a large concentration of truck trips in a short duration of time, particularly during peak demand hours, could have the potential for significant impacts to traffic volumes along Cherry Avenue, Carson Street and other nearby major transportation routes. However, adherence to the following mitigation measure will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level:

1. Prior to commencement of any construction activities, a truck schedule and transportation plan shall be submitted for the discretionary review and approval of the City's Traffic Engineer.

It is anticipated that any potential impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporation.

B. Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation:

Please see Section XVI (A) above for discussion. The mitigation measure set forth in Section XVI (A) above will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

C. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact:

This project is unrelated to air traffic.

D. Would the project substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No Impact:

The project will not alter existing public streets in any manner and therefore would not create any hazardous design features.

E. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact:

The project would have no impact on any emergency access routes.

F. Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?

No Impact:

The project site has a total of 40 parking space (26 standard spaces, 12 compact spaces and 2 disabled spaces). The project site with the proposed project would be required to provide 18 parking spaces under current Zoning Code requirements (3 parking spaces plus one additional space per every 100 storage units). The proposed will therefore not result in an inadequate parking capacity.

G. Would the project conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact:

The proposed project will have no impact on policies supporting alternative transportation.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The proposed project would not have any impact on any utility or service system since the project will simply add more floor area for self-storage units, which will not increase demand on any utility or service system.

No adverse impacts are anticipated to any utility or service system.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

No Impact:

The proposed project is within a well-established urbanized setting; there is no anticipated negative impact to any known fish or wildlife habitat or species.

- B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?**

No Impact:

The proposed project, which simply renovates an existing storage warehouse without a significant change in overall storage area due to existing vertical stacking space, is not anticipated to have a cumulative considerable effect on the environment.

- C. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

No Impact:

There are no adverse environmental effects to human life either directly or indirectly related to the proposed project.

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Measure 1: All construction activities shall conform to Rule 403 of the South Coast Air Quality Water District on Fugitive Dust.

Timing: Ongoing during construction.

Enforcement Agency: Department of Planning and Building

Measure 2: All wastewater on the project site resulting from construction cleanup activities shall be pumped and removed to an appropriate disposal facility in accordance with NPDES requirements.

Timing: Ongoing during construction.

Enforcement Agency: Department of Planning and Building

Measure 3: All streets and alleys in and on the perimeter of the project site shall be dry swept to minimize mud, along with all applicable NPDES requirements for pollutant reduction techniques when flushing paved surfaces.

Timing: Ongoing during construction.

Enforcement Agency: Department of Planning and Building

Measure 4: All project construction activities must conform to the City's Noise Ordinance. As stated in §8.80.202, "no person shall operate or permit the operation of any tools or equipment used for construction, alternation, repair, remodeling, drilling, demolition or any other related building activity which would produce loud or unusual noise which annoys or disturbs a reasonable person of normal sensitivity between the hours of seven p.m. and seven a.m."

Timing: Ongoing during construction.

Enforcement Agency: Department of Planning and Building,
Health Department

Measure 5: Prior to commencement of any construction activities, a truck schedule and transportation plan shall be submitted for the discretionary review and approval of the City's Traffic Engineer.

Timing: Ongoing during construction.

Enforcement Agency: Department of Public Works,
Traffic Engineering